DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 401 CE 001 968

AUTHOR Quirk, Daniel A.; Peavy, Nancy C.
TITLE A Comparative View of Services to Age Groups as Reported in the Employment Security Automated Reporting System. Middle-Aged and Older Workers in Industry: Facts & Trends No. 3.
INSTITUTION National Council on the Aging, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Age Groups; Employment Problems; *Employment Services; Job Placement; *Middle Aged; *National Surveys; *Older Adults; Tables (Data); Unemployment

ABSTRACT

The report focuses on services provided by the United States Public Employment Service (ES) to various age groups in the population. Most of the data were collected from the Employment Security Automated Reporting System at the Washington Office of the Manpower Administration. Counseling, referral to a nonagricultural job, and job placement were the three major service areas selected for analysis. The data relating type of service and age of ES applicant revealed, with few exceptions, that the proportion of the age group receiving a particular service consistently declined as age increased. Differences are shown among States in the services provided to ES applicants and to middleaged and older applicants in particular. It is the concern of the National Council on the Aging, not that middleaged and older workers be given special treatment, but that they receive as much attention as younger persons. An analysis of service plans of States with high rankings on services to the 40-plus applicant may provide more insights into equitable service delivery. Another concern raised is whether the recent thrust of Federal efforts to eliminate all categorical manpower/employment programs will present further employment obstacles for the over-40 worker. (EA)

ED 095401

MIDDLE-AGED AND OLDER WORKERS IN INDUSTRY
TRENDS NO. 3

A COMPARATIVE VIEW SERVICES TO AGE GROUPS

The Employment Security Automated Reporting System

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The National Institute on Aging (Pending)
A Program of
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

President: David G. Salten, Ph.D.

Vice Presidents:

Hugh W. Gaston, A.I.A. Adolph Holmes Harold L. Sheppard, Ph.D.
Inabel B. Lindsay, D.S.W.

Secretary: Mother M. Bernadette de Lourdes, O. Carm.

Treasurer: James R. Gunning

Executive Director: Jack Ossofsky

The National Council on the Aging, Inc., is a nonprofit corporation serving as a central resource for planning, informational materials, training, technical assistance and consultation in the field of older persons.

March 1974

A COMPARATIVE VIEW

OF

SERVICES TO AGE GROUPS

AS REPORTED IN

THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AUTOMATED REPORTING SYSTEM

by

Daniel A. Quirk, Senior Research Scientist

Nancy C. Peavy, Research Associate

Bette Kerr, Research Assistant

Michael D. Batten, Assistant Director for
Research and Demonstration

March 1974

The National Institute of Industrial Gerontology

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction.....1

Procedures.....3

Age Distribution of ES Applicants.....4

Services to All Age Groups.....5

Service Delivery by Age.....7

Conclusion.....11

TABLE 1. Total Employment Service Applicants and Those Receiving Selected Services for Fiscal Year 1973--by Age and State....14

TABLE 2. Total Employment Service Applicants and Those Receiving Selected Services by Age--National Totals for Fiscal Year 1973.....35

TABLE 3. Ranking of States by Selected Employment Service Variables.....36

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the staff of the Division of Data and Cost Analysis, U.S. Employment Service, for their assistance in the preparation of this report. The National Council on the Aging assumes full responsibility for data compilation, analysis and integration.

INTRODUCTION

The United States Public Employment Service (ES) has as one of its primary responsibilities the alleviation of unemployment. In its thousands of offices located throughout the country, the ES serves all types of persons in search of employment. Over the years, for many historical reasons the ES has assumed the difficult task of trying to help those who have the most difficulty in finding jobs: the young, the old, the handicapped and the socially disadvantaged.*

This report focuses on the services provided by the ES to the various age groups in the population. Do younger workers receive more attention than middle-aged and older workers? To what extent does the ES avoid unemployment by placing young people entering the job market for the first time rather than alleviating the unemployment of middle-aged and older workers who find themselves without work? What proportion of applicants over 65 are given service? While in some instances a younger applicant may require a different set of services than an older person seeking work, is one age group given significantly more attention by the ES than any other? In general, then, we hope to clarify the relationship between the age of an ES applicant and the service he receives.

---

*See E. Wight Bakke, THE MISSON OF MANPOWER POLICY, Kalamazoo, Michigan, The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1969, pp. 45-56.

Information Collected

The Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS) provides the data necessary to answer these questions. An extensive record-keeping and reporting system (ESARS) has been developed and is required of each local ES office. Each office must keep records of its services showing each month, among other items, the number of: (1) new and total applicants who are seeking employment; (2) counseling interviews; (3) tests administered; (4) referrals to agricultural and nonagricultural jobs; (5) placements; (6) referrals to other supportive services, and (7) applicants in training programs. The various categories of service are broken down by the demographic background of applicants who receive them. Data are collected and reported on applicants' age, sex, residence (urban, rural), ethnic group, education, military experience, special problems (alcoholism, vision, mental retardation, etc.) and other characteristics as required. Thus, while age data are collected on each applicant, we are not aware of any detailed investigations of the services provided to the various major age groupings.

With the advent of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 and Manpower Revenue Sharing, an age-oriented analysis of ESARS will prove helpful towards setting criteria for equitable allocations of resources and services for all age groups in, or seeking to enter, the labor force. This report is not meant to criticize individual offices, states or the ES itself. Instead, our concern is to merely point up possible inequities in the hope of encouraging efforts to alleviate them. No attempt will be made to evaluate the reporting system already developed and in operation. Rather, for the purposes of this report, the data collected under ESARS are

accepted as reliable information. It is assumed that any error in reporting is equally distributed throughout the ES offices and affects the data on the various age groups in much the same way.

PROCEDURES

Most of the data presented here were collected from ESARS at the Washington office of the Manpower Administration. Time and manpower constraints made it impossible to analyze by age all the ESARS-collected data. Three major service areas were selected for analysis: Counseling, referral to a nonagricultural job and job placement. In addition, data are reported on the total number of applicants receiving these and other services. The definitions for each of these major service areas, as reported in the ESARS HANDBOOK, are at the end of Table 1. Service areas not included in this analysis (see page 2) should be the focus of future studies on the relationship of age to employment services.

The ESARS service categories are reported for six age groupings: Under 22; 23-39; 40-44; 45-54; 55-64, and over 65. To highlight the services for middle-aged workers, the 40-44 and 45-54 categories have been combined in this analysis. Totals for all ages are also reported, and the entire analysis has been arranged by state totals for fiscal year 1973 with the states grouped by regions (Table 1). In addition, national totals covering the

same service areas and time period by age group may be found in Table 2. The age distribution of the total applicants served has also been included for each state and at the national level. While the information is presented by state and national totals, we expect the procedures outlined here could be easily adapted at the local level for those desiring to compare their efforts to those of the states, regions and the nation as a whole in terms of the three age groups (under 22, 22-44 and 45 and over) obtainable from ESARS table 91.

In Table 3, the states are ranked according to total services provided to all age groups as well as by services given to middle-aged and older workers (40-54 and 55-64). For example, the state with the highest proportion of total applicants was ranked "1," and the state with the lowest was ranked "51." States were not ranked according to counseling services by age groups because of the comparative scarcity of this service and lack of variability among states.

Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, in addition to the 50 states, are included in this analysis. Since the data for Washington state are not complete for the time period covered, it is not included in the national totals or in the ranking of states.

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ES APPLICANTS

The overwhelming majority of ES applicants in every state is under age 39. The highest proportion of younger applicants (83.4 percent) is found in the District of Columbia and the lowest (65.2 percent) in Connecticut. Most states approximate the national totals (Table 2) in which 76.3 percent of all applicants are less than 39. According to Bureau of Labor Statistics data for calendar 1973, 73 percent of all unemployed job seekers and 71 percent of all unemployed seeking jobs from public employment agencies are under age 35. About 93 percent of all ES applicants in fiscal 1973 were unemployed.

The highest proportion of applicants 40-64 are found in Nevada (30.8 percent) and the lowest (15.3 percent) in the District of Columbia. As with the proportion of those under 39, the variability among states in the proportion of middle-aged and older applicants (40-64) is slight, with most approximating the national figure of 21.7 percent.

A similar pattern holds for applicants 65 and over. While Wyoming has the highest proportion of such persons (5.8 percent) and Colorado and Mississippi the lowest (0.7 percent), there is little variability with most states centered around the national average of two percent.

These data clearly demonstrate that ES applicants, like other unemployed job seekers, tend to fall into the younger age groups. What, then, about service delivery? How many ES applicants receive service and what kinds? Is the applicant's age related in any way to the kind of service he will receive or the likelihood that he will receive any service at all?

SERVICES TO ALL AGE GROUPS

For each state (Table 1) and for the nation (Table 2), the proportion of all applicants receiving some service--counseling, referral and placement--is presented at the right of the tables. The number of total applicants in each state is, of course, related to the state's population and labor market variables. California had the highest number of applicants (1,734,019) and Delaware the lowest (38,692). In the nation, 43.8 percent of all applicants received some service; 6.5 percent were counseled; 33.4 percent were referred to nonagricultural jobs, and 16.9 percent were placed. Thus, throughout the United States in fiscal year 1973, less than 50 percent of the total applicants received some service from the ES, and approximately half of those referred to jobs were placed. Others received information about getting a

job on their own. A majority of unemployed job seekers use more than one method of job search and some may have obtained a job by other means before ES agencies had an opportunity to do more than take an application and provide information. Since the referral figures exclude agricultural jobs and the placement statistics include both agricultural and nonagricultural jobs, these figures are not strictly comparable. Most referrals to agricultural jobs are group referrals, however, and the number of referrals of individuals to such jobs is very small except in a few cases. Group referrals and mass placements are not included in these figures.

Of all the states, Mississippi has the highest proportion of total applicants (64.4 percent) receiving service. The only other states with more than three fifths receiving service were Nebraska (63.8 percent) and Texas (60.1 percent). (See Table 3 for ranking of states.) In five states and jurisdictions, one third or less of the applicants received counseling service.

Employment counseling is not a service frequently given by the ES. The District of Columbia counsels the highest proportion of their applicants (15.8 percent). It is interesting to note that the District also has the highest proportion of younger applicants, with these two facts possibly related. Only six other states counsel more than 10 percent of their applicants (Mississippi, Delaware, Maine, Montana, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island). Six states and jurisdictions give counseling interviews to less than four percent of their applicants.

Nebraska is the only state in which more than half of the applicants (50.6 percent) are referred to nonagricultural jobs. There are five other states in which more than 45 percent are referred: Rhode Island, Texas, Arkansas, Florida and Mississippi. Six states and jurisdictions refer less than one quarter of their applicants to nonagricultural jobs.

Nine states placed more than a quarter of their applicants in fiscal year 1973. And, as might be expected, states with high referral also tend

to have higher placement rates. Nebraska is the only state placing more than 30 percent of applicants (30.5), and the following states placed over 25 percent: Mississippi, Wyoming, Iowa, Arkansas, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Arizona. Less than 10 percent of applicants were placed in six states.

By themselves, these total statistics can tell us little about the effort expended to secure employment for middle-aged and older workers. At the same time, these data do not take into account a number of variables related to the amount of service given. The labor market is dynamic and differs from state to state and within states themselves. The staffing and budget patterns existing within ES offices are yet other variables related to the level of service delivery. Lastly, and perhaps most important, these total figures can in no way demonstrate the quality of service provided. However, these total figures do present a background against which to compare the following analysis by age groups.

SERVICE DELIVERY BY AGE

There is a distinctive and dramatic pattern which emerges from the data relating type of service and age of ES applicant. With few exceptions, the proportion of the age group receiving a particular service consistently declines as age increases. As the total figures discussed above demonstrated, there is variability from state to state in the amount of service provided applicants. But regardless of that amount, the older the applicant, the less likely he was to receive ES service.

The national totals (Table 2) reflect the pattern found in most states. While slightly more than half of the applicants under 22 (52.2 percent) received

some service, only one in four of those between 55 and 64 were accorded similar attention. It is important to note that less than one in 20 of those over 65 received service. Regardless of the type of service analyzed--counseling, referral, placement--the same pattern exists: The middle-aged and older applicant is less likely to receive service.

The Middle-Aged and Older Worker

In terms of receiving service, only five states provide some service to more than half of their 40-54-year-old applicants: Texas (55.0 percent); Nebraska (53.2 percent); South Dakota (52.6 percent); Mississippi (51.1 percent); and Maine (50.4 percent). The national average for this age group is 35 percent. There are only two states, Nebraska and Texas, which provide more than 40 percent of their applicants 55-64 with service, while nationally the average is one in four. At the same time, in each of these states, the younger age groups receive proportionately more service. Seven states and jurisdictions provide some service to less than one fourth of their applicants age 40-54, and eight states provide service to less than 17 percent of applicants 55-64.

Only two states, Nebraska (44.2 percent) and Texas (42.0 percent), referred more than two fifths of their applicants 40-54 to nonagricultural jobs. In the nation as a whole, 27 percent of this age group was referred. Seven states and jurisdictions referred less than a fifth of applicants 40-54. Nebraska also referred the highest percentage (36.9) of applicants 55-64 to nonagricultural jobs, with only Florida (33.1 percent), Texas (31.7 percent) and New Hampshire (30.0 percent) referring more than three in 10 applicants in

this age group. The national average for referral of this age group is 19.3 percent. In six states, less than 12 percent of the applicants age 55-64 were referred to nonagricultural jobs.

There are numerous barriers to employment of the worker over 40. Most are based on the irrational beliefs of employers, personnel managers--and sometimes the workers themselves--about the capabilities and potentials of the middle-aged and older worker. The data presented here demonstrate that this age group receives proportionately less service from the public ES than do younger applicants seeking jobs. It is not surprising, then, that the applicant aged 40-64 is less likely to be placed in a job. Only 13 percent of those 40-54, and 9.3 percent of those 55-64, were placed nationally in fiscal year 1973 compared to 21.4 percent of the under-22 group and 16.5 percent of those 22-39.

It is true that many states' ES offices are well above the national average in placement of middle-aged and older workers. Nine states placed a fifth or more of their applicants 40-54: Wyoming (23.5 percent); Montana (22.7 percent); Nebraska (22.6 percent); Mississippi (22.1 percent); Arkansas (21.6 percent); Arizona (21.1 percent); South Dakota (21.1 percent); Texas (21.0 percent) and Oregon (20.0 percent). Similarly, eight states placed more than 15 percent of applicants 55-64: Nebraska (19.4 percent); Wyoming (17.3 percent); Montana (16.3 percent); Oregon (16.1 percent); Mississippi (16.0 percent); Texas (15.8 percent); Arkansas (15.3 percent) and North Dakota (15.2 percent).

It is also the case that in many states placement of middle-aged and older workers was far below the national averages. In seven states, less than eight percent of the applicants aged 40-54 were placed, and in eight states less

than five percent of applicants aged 55-64 were placed.

The Over-65 Applicant

Without question, those over 65 receive the least attention from the ES. That is not surprising in light of the culturally accepted age of retirement. With an inadequate level of staffing, it might be reasonably argued that the employment problems of those under 65 should receive priority. However, there is a group of states where the pattern of dramatic decreases in service to those over 65 does not exist. In New Hampshire, Virginia, West Virginia, Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Arkansas, Montana, Wyoming and Utah, a higher proportion of the over-65 age group is given service in each area analyzed than the 55-64 group. In fact, in some instances the amount of service provided is equal or better than that given to even younger persons. There are still additional states in which a higher proportion of the over-65 group is given attention by the ES in particular services as opposed to the 55-64 group. Interestingly, there does not seem to be any relationship between the number of older people in a state and how much service is provided to that group. Florida and Arkansas rank first and second, respectively, in the proportion of those over 65 in the population, and both these states provide a comparatively high level of service to this age group. Yet, Utah ranks forty-seventh and Virginia forty-third in the proportion of aged in their populations, and the ES in these states also pays a comparatively high level of attention to applicants over 65.

Ranking Obscures Other Factors

The data unmistakably demonstrate that some state ES offices provide middle-aged and older applicants with more service than do others. The rankings presented in Table 3 do tend to obscure the situation in which service is given at the same level to all age groups. Given a certain level of staffing and budgeting, some offices may decide to allocate their available resources evenly to all age groups, while others consciously concentrate on younger or older applicants. For example, in Oregon, the difference between the proportion of those receiving service under 22 and those 55-64 is only 15.1 percent. The placement figures for these age groups differ by only 6.6 percent in the state. Yet, Oregon ranks seventeenth in total service and 20.5 in placement of all applicants. At the same time, Mississippi ranks first in total services and second in total placement, but the difference between age groups is much greater than in Oregon. There is a difference of 32.5 percentage points between the proportion of those under 22 and those 55-64 who receive service in Mississippi, and there is a difference of 17.2 in placement figures.

CONCLUSION

There are any number of possible explanations for the differences which exist between states in the services provided to ES applicants and to middle-aged and older applicants in particular. No attempt has been made in this report to control for these factors which include the staffing and budgeting patterns of ES offices; others included are the many labor market variables

which differ, sometimes significantly, within states, from state to state and from region to region. Acknowledgement is made of the existence of these factors and their possible effect on the data presented here. Any final interpretation of these data should take these factors into consideration.

It is evident that the rankings alone do not tell the complete story. While such a ranking system gives some organization to these data, it does tend to obscure other factors, such as the distribution of available resources to all age groups and the effect of labor market variables. In addition, quantitative measures do not indicate the quality of the services provided. A state relatively low in the amount of service delivered may, in fact, rank high in the kind of attention and assistance it gives to applicants it does serve. So the data for each state should be examined individually as well as in comparison to other states.

It is also evident that many states actually distribute service more equitably among age groups than other states. We do not believe that middle-aged and older workers should be given special treatment. Each age group has unique employment problems and potentials around which ES services should be developed and provided. It is only just that the concerns of middle-aged and older applicants receive as much attention as those of younger persons. State ES offices which do a comparatively good job in regard to this age group can serve as models to other offices. An analysis of the techniques used and the service plans developed by states with high rankings on services to the 40-plus applicant may result in valuable insights into equitable service delivery. This report will hopefully spark an investigation that ultimately

provides middle-aged and older ES applicants with brighter employment prospects.

In recent years, elimination of all categorical manpower and employment programs has been a major thrust of Federal efforts. Attempts to treat any segment of the labor force as special are to be minimized while activities leading toward job placement for all are to be maximized. If such a trend in referral and placement efforts results in emphasizing a worker or job applicant's functional capabilities rather than his chronological age, NCOA favors such an approach.

We should, however, not deceive ourselves. All of us grow older regardless of sex, race, disability or ethnic background. This brief analysis of ESARS indicates that age is a constraint to employment opportunity. While decategorization may be a fine idea, its application may present further employment obstacles for the over-40 worker. Manpower planners, trainers and program personnel would do well to keep this in mind as they work--and age.

TABLE 1: TOTAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE APPLICANTS AND THOSE RECEIVING SELECTED SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973 - BY AGE AND STATE[1]

REGION I

CONNECTICUT	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	81,725	167,195	75,204	36,722	20,654	381,500
% Receiving Service*	49.9	37.0	28.0	18.2	6.8	34.6 (131,818)
% Counseled*	6.4	4.4	2.7	1.5	.5	4.0 (15,323)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)*	40.0	31.5	23.9	15.8	5.9	28.9 (110,288)
% Placed*	15.8	8.8	6.1	3.5	1.2	8.9 (33,819)
Age Distribution	21.4	43.8	19.7	9.6	5.4	99.9
MAINE						
Applicants	20,510	33,408	11,260	4,890	1,608	71,676
% Receiving Service	67.6	60.3	50.4	38.2	29.5	58.6 (42,033)
% Counseled	14.5	11.6	11.2	7.3	5.0	11.9 (8,544)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	51.1	45.5	35.7	26.4	19.7	43.7 (31,304)
% Placed	27.0	22.2	16.7	11.1	8.6	21.6 (15,499)
Age Distribution	28.6	46.6	15.7	6.8	2.2	99.9
MASSACHUSETTS						
Applicants	126,074	223,087	85,983	43,302	21,377	498,823
% Receiving Service	47.1	37.9	29.9	16.9	5.5	35.6 (177,725)
% Counseled	12.0	10.0	8.0	3.7	0.7	9.2 (45,954)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	32.2	25.9	20.1	11.9	4.3	24.4 (121,523)
% Placed	14.5	9.4	7.1	4.2	1.7	9.5 (47,356)
Age Distribution	25.1	44.7	17.2	8.7	4.3	100.0

[1]Footnote at end of Table

*Terms defined at end of Table

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION I (contd)

NEW HAMPSHIRE	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	15,740	23,758	9,483	4,867	1,842	55,690
% Receiving Service	64.4	53.4	40.8	34.4	51.0	52.6 (29,312)
% Counseled	7.2	6.7	5.5	4.5	9.4	6.5 (3,642)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	52.8	45.3	35.6	30.0	47.1	44.8 (24,967)
% Placed	24.3	17.2	13.0	9.1	22.7	17.9 (9,991)
Age Distribution	28.3	42.7	17.0	8.7	3.3	100.0

RHODE ISLAND						
Applicants	18,726	30,291	12,317	5,125	682	67,141
% Receiving Service	74.0	58.1	44.3	31.4	21.8	57.6 (38,663)
% Counseled	13.0	11.3	9.5	5.4	2.6	10.9 (7,317)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	60.1	47.3	36.0	26.4	19.1	46.9 (31,522)
% Placed	26.2	16.8	13.4	10.1	11.4	18.2 (12,253)
Age Distribution	27.9	45.1	18.3	7.6	1.0	99.9

VERMONT						
Applicants	15,250	27,057	7,766	3,463	1,445	54,981
% Receiving Service	54.7	46.4	35.9	21.4	11.7	44.7 (24,589)
% Counseled	10.0	7.7	6.9	2.3	1.5	7.7 (4,225)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	45.5	39.5	30.0	18.9	10.0	37.7 (20,752)
% Placed	22.3	17.0	12.4	7.0	4.9	16.9 (9,265)
Age Distribution	27.7	49.2	14.1	6.3	2.6	99.9

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION II

NEW JERSEY	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	133,496	243,005	111,257	53,718	27,889	569,365
% Receiving Service	45.7	34.1	23.3	13.8	6.3	31.4 (178,908)
% Counseled	13.5	7.3	4.4	2.3	1.2	7.4 (42,228)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	30.2	25.4	17.9	10.8	4.8	22.7 (129,140)
% Placed	13.9	9.7	7.4	4.5	2.2	9.4 (53,509)
Age Distribution	23.4	42.7	19.5	9.4	4.9	99.9
NEW YORK						
Applicants	265,635	583,765	180,695	70,019	29,581	1,129,695
% Receiving Service	58.4	50.6	40.5	32.0	21.1	48.9 (552,262)
% Counseled	14.3	10.0	6.3	4.8	5.2	9.9 (112,262)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	39.1	37.0	29.6	22.9	12.6	34.8 (393,201)
% Placed	16.6	15.6	12.3	10.0	6.1	14.7 (166,375)
Age Distribution	23.5	51.7	16.0	6.2	2.6	100 0
PUERTO RICO						
Applicants	117,107	201,629	58,095	16,924	5,116	398,871
% Receiving Service	31.1	21.1	19.2	18.6	18.9	23.6 (94,178)
% Counseled	5.8	2.8	2.1	1.1	0.8	3.5 (13,897)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	21.2	16.5	14.8	13.6	14.4	17.4 (69,575)
% Placed	13.6	8.8	9.6	12.4	12.0	10.5 (41,992)
Age Distribution	29.4	50.5	14.6	4.2	1.3	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION III

DELAWARE	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	8,357	18,039	7,546	3,003	1,747	38,692
% Receiving Service	61.6	33.5	18.8	10.8	3.0	33.6 (12,985)
% Counseled	38.4	7.7	4.6	2.8	0.7	13.0 (5,043)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	33.3	26.4	14.4	8.5	2.3	23.1 (8,933)
% Placed	15.1	10.8	5.9	3.9	1.0	9.8 (3,798)
Age Distribution	21.6	46.6	19.5	7.8	4.5	100.0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA						
Applicants	65,629	63,722	17,272	6,548	1,995	155,166
% Receiving Service	60.9	31.9	25.3	20.3	14.2	42.7 (66,254)
% Counseled	26.1	8.0	8.1	10.6	7.9	15.8 (24,497)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	41.6	22.0	15.6	9.6	5.8	28.8 (44,714)
% Placed	31.9	8.7	7.3	4.0	2.7	18.1 (28,058)
Age Distribution	42.3	41.1	11.1	4.2	1.3	100.0
MARYLAND						
Applicants	69,637	115,198	39,803	15,749	5,345	245,732
% Receiving Service	45.4	35.5	25.3	17.4	15.9	35.1 (86,224)
% Counseled	7.0	6.0	3.6	2.3	1.6	5.5 (13,635)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	36.2	28.7	20.7	14.6	13.9	28.3 (69,499)
% Placed	17.0	11.8	9.4	6.8	7.4	12.5 (30,625)
Age Distribution	28.3	46.9	16.2	6.4	2.2	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION III (contd)

PENNSYLVANIA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	238,187	324,875	133,343	58,217	25,053	779,675
% Receiving Service	60.2	48.6	36.6	25.5	14.5	47.3 (368,484)
% Counseled	14.2	11.6	8.3	6.1	3.8	11.2 (87,320)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	42.0	35.1	25.9	17.4	9.3	33.5 (260,956)
% Placed	25.1	17.7	12.8	8.6	5.0	18.0 (140,721)
Age Distribution	30.5	41.7	17.1	7.5	3.2	100.0
VIRGINIA						
Applicants	115,149	146,661	46,677	15,289	4,595	328,371
% Receiving Service	55.6	51.5	39.4	27.1	31.1	49.8 (163,504)
% Counseled	10.1	6.7	6.0	5.0	6.4	7.7 (25,235)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	41.0	39.8	30.1	20.9	24.8	37.8 (124,033)
% Placed	24.1	21.1	16.2	11.2	14.6	20.9 (68,706)
Age Distribution	35.1	44.7	14.2	4.7	1.4	100.1
WEST VIRGINIA						
Applicants	59,225	79,902	25,763	8,701	2,149	175,740
% Receiving Service	46.7	37.8	31.4	20.0	25.7	38.8 (68,226)
% Counseled	11.5	9.8	8.2	4.3	4.7	9.8 (17,273)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	28.2	26.2	20.5	13.7	13.9	25.3 (44,479)
% Placed	18.5	14.5	12.0	8.0	12.6	15.1 (26,601)
Age Distribution	33.7	45.5	14.7	5.0	1.2	100.1

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION IV

ALABAMA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	116,574	126,322	42,292	13,713	4,089	302,990
% Receiving Service	52.7	46.8	37.3	26.5	27.3	46.6 (141,141)
% Counseled	8.9	5.1	3.2	2.0	3.6	6.1 (18,600)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	39.8	39.9	31.6	22.9	23.4	37.[illegible] (114,231)
% Placed	24.4	20.5	17.0	12.7	15.0	21.1 (63,958)
Age Distribution	38.5	41.7	14.0	4.5	1.3	100.0
FLORIDA						
Applicants	132,530	207,899	74,217	28,231	9,005	451,882
% Receiving Service	65.4	56.0	46.6	39.3	46.6	56.0 (252,952)
% Counseled	8.6	4.9	3.8	2.7	4.4	5.6 (25,449)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	52.1	46.3	38.8	33.1	38.8	45.8 (206,898)
% Placed	23.8	20.5	17.2	13.5	18.5	20.4 (92,360)
Age Distribution	29.3	46.0	16.4	6.3	2.0	100.0
GEORGIA						
Applicants	129,343	187,057	54,692	16,944	3,994	392,030
% Receiving Service	51.6	43.8	34.5	26.0	18.1	44.1 (172,686)
% Counseled	7.0	6.2	4.3	3.2	2.8	6.0 (23,610)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	39.8	34.4	26.9	20.4	14.9	34.3 (134,546)
% Placed	22.8	18.2	15.1	11.7	10.1	18.9 (74,204)
Age Distribution	33.0	47.7	14.0	4.3	1.0	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION IV (contd)

	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
KENTUCKY						
Applicants	92,058	141,562	48,177	15,764	3,141	300,702
% Receiving Service	46.6	36.0	26.4	21.2	21.5	36.8 (110,634)
% Counseled	10.9	5.4	4.1	2.3	2.6	6.7 (20,121)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	29.3	26.6	19.3	15.3	16.8	25.6 (76,944)
% Placed	17.4	14.0	9.8	7.7	10.4	14.0 (42,132)
Age Distribution	30.6	47.1	16.0	5.2	1.0	99.9
MISSISSIPPI						
Applicants	105,473	102,797	34,876	11,765	1,669	256,580
% Receiving Service	69.3	67.5	51.1	36.8	39.5	64.4 (165,244)
% Counseled	18.8	13.0	10.1	6.2	7.4	14.7 (37,609)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	47.7	49.9	35.8	25.6	28.4	45.8 (117,614)
% Placed	33.2	30.6	22.1	16.0	19.9	29.8 (76,346)
Age Distribution	41.1	40.1	13.6	4.6	0.7	100.1
NORTH CAROLINA						
Applicants	141,317	208,397	71,282	24,874	6,634	452,504
% Receiving Service	55.2	50.4	39.1	27.9	26.2	48.6 (219,692)
% Counseled	5.5	4.0	3.5	2.6	1.9	4.3 (19,366)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	39.9	38.7	29.3	21.2	19.4	36.4 (164,714)
% Placed	21.5	17.9	14.6	10.5	11.7	18.0 (81,381)
Age Distribution	31.2	46.1	15.8	5.5	1.5	100.1

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION IV (contd)

SOUTH CAROLINA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	76,510	99,419	32,968	10,328	2,247	221,472
% Receiving Service	60.7	53.9	44.5	35.8	27.2	53.8 (119,067)
% Counseled	7.2	4.1	3.1	2.6	1.5	4.9 (10,871)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	43.7	42.7	34.2	27.5	19.5	40.8 (90,418)
% Placed	25.2	20.4	18.0	14.7	12.6	21.4 (47,289)
Age Distribution	34.5	44.9	14.9	4.7	1.0	100.0
TENNESSEE						
Applicants	109,162	149,881	46,039	13,434	4,416	322,932
% Receiving Service	58.8	53.4	41.3	29.2	50.0	52.5 (169,439)
% Counseled	4.8	4.6	4.0	2.1	1.8	4.4 (14,370)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	47.3	43.9	33.0	24.2	45.8	42.7 (137,988)
% Placed	27.3	23.0	17.7	13.3	28.9	23.4 (75,508)
Age Distribution	33.8	46.4	14.3	4.2	1.4	100.1

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION V

ILLINOIS	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	234,101	372,899	132,607	50,332	21,564	811,503
% Receiving Service	45.0	32.4	23.8	16.8	12.5	33.1 (268,902)
% Counseled	10.5	6.2	4.2	3.0	2.4	6.8 (55,160)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	24.5	23.5	17.4	11.6	8.0	21.6 (175,656)
% Placed	12.7	9.8	7.3	4.7	4.0	9.8 (79,469)
Age Distribution	28.8	46.0	16.3	6.2	2.7	100.0

INDIANA						
Applicants	169,554	209,830	73,133	27,251	8,939	488,707
% Receiving Service	47.9	41.0	29.5	20.6	17.6	40.1 (196,100)
% Counseled	5.2	3.9	2.5	1.4	1.3	3.9 (19,253)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	38.2	36.0	26.2	18.3	15.3	33.9 (165,702)
% Placed	24.3	16.5	11.5	8.0	9.0	17.8 (87,138)
Age Distribution	34.7	42.9	15.0	5.6	1.9	100.1

MICHIGAN						
Applicants	226,623	443,162	153,265	58,096	22,209	903,355
% Receiving Service	36.3	30.7	17.7	10.4	11.4	28.1 (253,923)
% Counseled	6.5	5.8	3.3	1.5	1.2	5.2 (46,620)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	26.4	23.1	13.1	8.0	9.4	20.9 (189,048)
% Placed	12.2	10.2	5.5	3.6	4.9	9.3 (84,173)
Age Distribution	25.1	49.1	17.0	6.4	2.5	100.1

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION V (contd)

MINNESOTA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	121,797	136,417	39,362	17,029	3,363	317,968
% Receiving Service	43.1	39.8	33.5	24.6	26.2	39.3 (125,036)
% Counseled	6.1	5.6	4.4	1.8	0.6	5.4 (17,138)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	31.0	31.1	25.8	19.9	21.6	29.7 (94,421)
% Placed	16.9	13.9	11.3	9.6	14.9	14.5 (46,192)
Age Distribution	38.3	42.9	12.4	5.4	1.1	100.1
OHIO						
Applicants	196,485	355,301	131,395	44,596	7,937	735,714
% Receiving Service	46.0	35.5	23.9	16.9	13.8	34.9 (256,449)
% Counseled	6.3	5.9	3.4	1.6	0.5	5.2 (38,532)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	37.0	29.8	20.3	14.7	12.2	28.9 (212,733)
% Placed	16.2	12.3	8.0	5.6	5.6	12.1 (88,843)
Age Distribution	26.7	48.3	17.9	6.1	1.1	100.1
WISCONSIN						
Applicants	118,021	158,362	49,094	21,405	8,187	355,069
% Receiving Service	47.7	44.0	30.5	18.8	14.7	41.2 (146,195)
% Counseled	9.2	6.9	5.2	2.8	1.8	7.1 (25,107)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	38.2	36.7	25.4	15.5	12.3	33.8 (119,967)
% Placed	16.5	13.1	8.8	5.1	5.1	13.0 (46,091)
Age Distribution	33.2	44.6	13.8	6.0	2.3	99.9

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VI

ARKANSAS	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	80,671	88,559	29,424	10,164	2,453	211,271
% Receiving Service	60.4	60.8	48.6	32.9	56.8	57.5 (121,526)
% Counseled	5.7	4.5	3.7	2.9	5.3	4.8 (10,148)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	47.8	49.2	38.5	26.2	47.9	46.1 (97,316)
% Placed	39.7	39.1	21.6	15.3	30.6	26.7 (56,297)
Age Distribution	38.2	41.9	13.9	4.3	1.2	100.0
LOUISIANA						
Applicants	113,506	147,820	49,636	18,774	4,350	334,086
% Receiving Service	41.8	36.5	24.5	14.3	10.9	34.9 (116,700)
% Counseled	5.0	3.7	1.6	0.5	0.3	3.6 (12,128)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	30.5	29.4	20.5	12.1	8.6	27.2 (90,939)
% Placed	18.1	15.1	11.4	7.3	5.5	15.0 (50,203)
Age Distribution	34.0	44.2	14.9	5.6	1.3	100.0
NEW MEXICO						
Applicants	53,126	69,477	20,681	7,266	1,500	152,050
% Receiving Service	44.9	36.7	32.1	21.8	22.7	38.1 (57,906)
% Counseled	8.1	5.6	4.1	1.9	1.5	6.0 (9,181)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	34.4	29.1	25.0	17.1	16.9	29.7 (45,182)
% Placed	19.7	14.6	12.7	8.3	12.5	15.8 (24,049)
Age Distribution	34.9	45.7	13.6	4.8	1.0	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VI (contd)

OKLAHOMA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	84,343	131,704	45,859	16,690	3,550	282,146
% Receiving Service	51.3	47.5	40.9	26.3	21.8	46.0 (129,752)
% Counseled	11.7	9.0	7.7	4.5	3.2	9.3 (26,147)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	35.4	34.3	28.0	17.5	15.7	32.4 (91,331)
% Placed	24.4	21.2	18.1	12.1	11.7	21.0 (59,351)
Age Distribution	29.9	46.7	16.3	5.9	1.3	100.1
TEXAS						
Applicants	354,544	455,650	159,313	54,220	10,531	1,034,258
% Receiving Service	60.0	64.7	55.0	41.7	35.6	60.1 (621,613)
% Counseled	7.7	7.4	5.5	4.4	4.6	7.0 (72,425)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	46.9	50.2	42.0	31.7	26.8	46.6 (481,571)
% Placed	23.0	23.2	21.0	15.8	14.9	22.3 (230,627)
Age Distribution	34.3	44.1	15.4	5.2	1.0	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VII

IOWA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	82,524	91,002	27,799	10,768	2,410	214,503
% Receiving Service	64.4	58.2	47.5	36.2	45.8	57.9 (124,273)
% Counseled	4.2	5.5	4.2	1.8	1.5	4.6 (9,911)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	43.8	45.7	34.7	25.3	36.8	42.4 (91,041)
% Placed	37.5	24.3	17.9	13.3	25.6	28.1 (60,171)
Age Distribution	38.5	42.4	13.0	5.0	1.1	100.0
KANSAS						
Applicants	64,577	76,382	24,296	8,848	3,059	177,162
% Receiving Service	58.2	54.3	44.7	31.1	26.6	52.8 (93,499)
% Counseled	8.2	9.1	8.6	4.7	3.1	8.4 (14,824)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	43.1	40.9	32.7	24.2	21.3	39.4 (69,816)
% Placed	29.5	21.3	17.7	13.2	14.2	23.2 (41,190)
Age Distribution	36.5	43.1	13.7	5.0	1.7	100.0
MISSOURI						
Applicants	144,859	176,951	59,362	20,430	5,390	406,992
% Receiving Service	51.4	49.3	36.1	26.1	24.8	46.6 (189,742)
% Counseled	5.6	4.8	3.6	2.7	2.3	4.8 (19,495)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	39.1	40.4	29.1	21.3	21.2	37.1 (150,980)
% Placed	22.5	20.1	14.3	10.5	12.0	19.5 (79,475)
Age Distribution	35.6	43.5	14.6	5.0	1.3	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VII (contd)

NEBRASKA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	37,938	40,233	12,576	4,661	1,635	97,043
% Receiving Service	73.8	60.6	53.2	44.1	49.2	63.8 (61,933)
% Counseled	5.8	6.7	5.0	3.5	3.2	5.9 (5,752)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	54.0	51.2	44.2	36.9	43.7	50.6 (49,075)
% Placed	40.3	25.1	22.6	19.4	27.8	30.5 (29,567)
Age Distribution	39.1	41.5	13.0	4.8	1.7	100.1

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VIII

COLORADO	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	83,960	119,660	30,028	9,145	1,662	244,455
% Receiving Service	48.5	40.8	35.8	25.5	35.6	42.2 (103,158)
% Counseled	9.9	5.3	5.8	3.1	3.1	6.8 (16,741)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	36.9	32.8	27.4	20.2	30.4	33.1 (80,869)
% Placed	18.9	15.2	13.3	9.8	17.6	16.1 (39,260)
Age Distribution	34.3	48.9	12.3	3.7	0.7	99.9

MONTANA						
Applicants	36,865	45,121	14,508	5,788	1,303	103,585
% Receiving Service	51.6	46.0	37.9	26.5	26.8	45.5 (47,141)
% Counseled	15.3	11.6	8.1	3.6	4.2	11.9 (12,322)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	32.6	30.7	23.2	15.7	17.0	29.3 (30,358)
% Placed	30.1	26.6	22.7	16.9	17.4	26.6 (27,596)
Age Distribution	35.6	43.6	14.0	5.6	1.3	100.1

NORTH DAKOTA						
Applicants	29,253	33,261	8,681	3,668	899	75,762
% Receiving Service	62.4	57.9	43.1	33.1	31.3	56.4 (42,731)
% Counseled	8.3	7.1	6.5	3.1	1.8	7.2 (5,470)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	46.5	48.0	33.3	26.9	25.7	44.4 (33,649)
% Placed	31.1	25.0	17.7	15.2	16.4	25.9 (19,642)
Age Distribution	38.6	43.9	11.5	4.8	1.2	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION VIII (contd)

SOUTH DAKOTA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	31,949	31,681	9,219	3,862	1,028	77,739
% Receiving Service	61.6	59.4	52.6	35.8	32.9	58.0 (45,059)
% Counseled	9.5	10.1	11.0	5.7	1.5	9.6 (7,498)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	46.5	46.4	39.1	27.4	27.1	44.4 (34,533)
% Placed	30.2	25.0	21.1	14.8	17.8	26.0 (20,245)
Age Distribution	41.1	40.8	11.9	5.0	1.3	100.1
UTAH						
Applicants	54,593	61,777	17,275	6,159	2,376	142,180
% Receiving Service	60.0	54.5	45.4	29.8	43.6	54.3 (77,159)
% Counseled	5.9	8.6	7.4	3.0	4.1	7.1 (10,099)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	49.2	45.4	37.4	25.9	36.0	44.9 (63,811)
% Placed	24.8	21.4	17.3	11.8	18.5	21.7 (30,906)
Age Distribution	38.4	43.4	12.2	4.3	1.7	100.0
WYOMING						
Applicants	13,378	17,826	5,535	1,936	2,385	41,060
% Receiving Service	55.9	50.4	43.6	33.0	52.2	50.6 (20,770)
% Counseled	6.7	8.5	6.2	3.1	9.7	7.4 (3,033)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	42.2	37.5	31.4	24.2	37.4	37.6 (15,424)
% Placed	33.4	27.9	23.5	17.3	31.8	28.8 (11,831)
Age Distribution	32.6	43.4	13.5	4.7	5.8	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION IX

ARIZONA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	83,891	124,097	43,542	15,208	2,945	269,683
% Receiving Service	69.4	55.2	47.4	32.6	25.4	56.7 (153,021)
% Counseled	2.6	3.2	2.6	1.1	0.7	2.8 (7,495)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	53.9	44.4	34.7	26.0	20.7	44.8 (120,933)
% Placed	30.8	24.1	21.1	14.4	11.5	25.0 (67,459)
Age Distribution	31.1	46.0	16.2	5.6	1.1	100.0
CALIFORNIA						
Applicants	449,325	867,302	305,409	89,096	22,887	1,734,019
% Receiving Service	46.6	43.3	38.8	31.9	29.0	42.6 (738,679)
% Counseled	3.4	4.2	2.9	1.7	1.4	3.6 (62,345)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	37.4	35.9	30.6	26.1	24.4	34.7 (601,099)
% Placed	22.5	17.5	15.3	12.6	14.2	18.1 (314,053)
Age Distribution	25.9	50.0	17.6	5.1	1.3	99.9
HAWAII						
Applicants	34,477	48,649	13,760	6,707	2,828	106,391
% Receiving Service	44.4	36.2	27.9	16.9	9.8	35.8 (38,118)
% Counseled	5.8	4.5	3.3	1.2	0.8	4.5 (4,806)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	33.3	30.3	23.2	14.1	7.6	28.7 (30,546)
% Placed	17.7	10.5	8.1	4.6	1.9	11.9 (12,706)
Age Distribution	32.4	45.7	12.9	6.3	2.7	100.0

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION IX (contd)

NEVADA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	23,241	50,218	24,594	9,504	2,787	110,344
% Receiving Service	46.4	35.9	31.5	21.1	15.8	35.4 (39,020)
% Counseled	4.8	3.4	2.3	1.4	0.7	3.2 (3,532)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	37.8	29.1	26.0	17.4	12.9	28.8 (31,787)
% Placed	20.8	15.6	14.6	10.1	8.1	15.8 (17,467)
Age Distribution	21.1	45.5	22.2	8.6	2.5	99.9

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION X

ALASKA	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	12,660	25,864	6,849	1,857	375	47,605
% Receiving Service	53.8	50.2	39.2	26.2	20.5	48.4 (23,053)
% Counseled	5.9	6.0	5.4	3.9	6.7	5.8 (2,773)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	40.9	37.6	30.0	20.4	13.9	36.4 (17,347)
% Placed	25.6	22.0	15.1	10.2	6.9	21.4 (10,166)
Age Distribution	26.6	54.3	14.4	3.9	0.8	100.0
IDAHO						
Applicants	37,272	47,389	17,290	7,050	1,605	110,606
% Receiving Service	52.2	47.4	37.3	24.8	21.1	45.7 (50,489)
% Counseled	7.1	6.7	4.4	2.1	1.2	6.1 (6,742)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	37.5	36.2	26.2	17.2	14.1	33.5 (37,094)
% Placed	25.8	22.2	17.0	11.1	11.6	21.7 (24,040)
Age Distribution	33.7	42.8	15.6	6.4	1.5	100.0
OREGON						
Applicants	85,708	129,405	36,077	12,036	5,233	268,459
% Receiving Service	52.6	52.8	48.5	37.5	34.7	51.1 (137,240)
% Counseled	7.2	8.8	7.4	4.0	4.3	7.8 (20,936)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	40.0	40.2	35.1	27.8	27.8	38.7 (103,777)
% Placed	22.7	20.5	20.0	16.1	15.8	20.9 (55,978)
Age Distribution	31.9	48.2	13.4	4.5	1.9	99.9

TABLE 1 (continued)

REGION X (contd)

WASHINGTON[2]	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	48,221	118,692	30,697	10,953	3,509	212,072
% Receiving Service	22.9	29.5	20.9	13.4	5.7	25.5 (54,093)
% Counseled	2.4	2.4	2.1	0.9	0.3	2.3 (4,771)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	17.6	21.9	16.7	11.3	4.8	19.3 (40,993)
% Placed	2.0	2.9	1.5	0.9	0.4	2.4 (4,978)
Age Distribution	22.7	56.0	14.5	5.2	1.7	100.1

1 Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS), Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., Monthly year to date for period ending 06/30/73, Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6.

2 Data for Washington State only for 1st quarter fiscal year 1973

* Definition of terms (ESARS Handbook):

Receiving Service - Services refer to manpower activities related to training and employment efforts, such as those listed below, which are provided by employment service offices and which are designed to result in the training and/or employment of the applicant. Included among these services are the following:

Counseling, testing, job development contact, enrollment in orientation, enrollment in training, referral to training, referral to supportive service, job referral, placement, followup contacts.

Counseled - An interview (1) in which a face-to-face discussion occurs between a specially trained or designated counselor in which the counselor helps the applicant resolve problems of vocational choice, vocational change, or vocational adjustment; and (2) which results in obtaining and recording on the applicant's card and/or other appropriate applicant records one or more of the following (a) a summary statement to establish the existence of a vocational problem, (b) additional information contributing to a sharper definition of the problem or to its solution, (c) a statement of a vocational plan or recommendation for the solution of the problem, (d) a statement concerning the outcome and effectiveness of the counseling service elicited in the course of the followup.

Referred (Non-Agric) - Arranged to bring to the attention of an employer (or another local office) an applicant who is available for a job under one of the following conditions:

1. An opening existed prior to the referral.

2. No opening existed but the employer actually hires the applicant.

Placed - Hired for a job by an employer to whom an individual was referred by the employment office for a job or an interview, providing that the employment office completed all of the following steps: (a) made prior arrangements with the employer for the referral of an individual or individuals; (b) referred an individual who had not been specifically designated by the employer; (c) verified from a reliable source, preferably the employer, that the individual had entered on a job; and (d) recorded the transaction on an employer order form and other appropriate ES forms.

TABLE 2: TOTAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE APPLICANTS AND THOSE RECEIVING SELECTED SERVICES BY AGE - NATIONAL TOTALS FISCAL YEAR 1973[1]

	Under 22	22-39	40-54	55-64	65 and Over	Total for All Ages
Applicants	5,311,618	8,060,930	2,767,576	1,024,136	341,663	17,505,923
% Receiving Service	52.2	44.7	35.1	25.0	4.9	43.8 (7,665,237)
% Counseled	8.5	6.5	4.7	3.0	0.6	6.5 (1,142,004)
% Referred (Non-Agric.)	38.4	35.0	27.0	19.3	3.8	33.4 (5,854,271)
% Placed	21.4	16.5	13.0	9.3	2.1	16.9 (2,955,931)
Age Distribution	30.3	46.0	15.8	5.9	2.0	100.0

[1]Washington excluded because comparable data not available. Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia are included in the totals.

TABLE 3. RANKING OF STATES BY SELECTED EMPLOYMENT SERVICE VARIABLES[1]

	Total ES Applicants	Applicants Receiving Service			Applicants Counseled[2]	Applicants Referred			Applicants Placed		
		All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	40-54	55-64
REGION I											
Connecticut	16	46	40	42	45	37.5	37	36	51	49	51
Maine	45	4	5	4	4.5	12	9	9.5	15	20	23.5
Massachusetts	9	41	38	45	12	46	44	46	48	48	47
New Hampshire	47	15	19	10	26	8.5	10	4	30	30	33
Rhode Island	46	7	14	17	7	2	7	9.5	25	28	28.5
Vermont	48	29	30	34	15.5	19.5	22.5	29	32	33	40
REGION II											
New Jersey	8	49	48	49	17.5	48	46	48	49	45	46
New York	2	20	20	15	8	25	24	20.5	38	34	30
Puerto Rico	14	51	49	41	49	51	49	44	45	40	18
REGION III											
Delaware	51	47	50	50	3	47	50	50	46.5	50	49
D.C.	35	31	43.5	38	1	39.5	48	49	26.5	46.5	48
Maryland	28	43	43.5	43	34	42	40	41	42	41	41
Pennsylvania	6	23	28	29.5	6	30.5	33	32.5	28.5	31	34
Virginia	19	19	21	22	15.5	18	21	24	20.5	21	22
W. Virginia	34	37	36	39	9	45	41.5	43	36	35	36.5

1. States are ranked in order of decreasing percentages--higest is rank 1, lowest is 51.

   States with identical percentages are assigned the same rank in the following way: if two states are tied for rank 4, then each is assigned rank 4.5 and the next state assigned 6 (i.e., 3, 4.5, 4.5, 6); if three states are tied for rank 4, each is assigned rank 5 and the next state is assigned 7 (i.e., 3, 5, 5, 5, 7).

2. Not ranked by age due to generally low level of service and lack of variability among states.

TABLE 3 (continued)

	Total ES Applicants	Applicants Receiving Service			Applicants Counseled	Applicants Referred			Applicants Placed		
		All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	40-54	55-64
REGION IV											
Alabama	22	24.5	26.5	23.5	27.5	19.5	18	20.5	18	18.5	16
Florida	12	11	10	3	33	5.5	4	2	22	17	12
Georgia	15	30	32	28	29.5	27	29	25.5	24	23.5	21
Kentucky	23	39	42	35	25	44	45	39	40	39	38
Mississippi	27	1	4	6	2	5.5	8	15	2	4	5
N. Carolina	11	21	23	21	44	23.5	25	23	28.5	25.5	25.5
S. Carolina	30	13	13	8.5	38	15	14	6	16.5	11	10
Tennessee	20	16	17	20	43	13	16	18	10	14	13.5
REGION V											
Illinois	5	48	47	47	23.5	49	47	47	46.5	46.5	44
Indiana	10	35	39	37	46	28	30.5	30	31	36	36.5
Michigan	4	50	51	51	36.5	50	51	51	50	51	50
Minnesota	21	36	33	32	35	34.5	34	28	39	38	32
Ohio	7	44.5	46	45	36.5	37.5	43	40	43	44	42
Wisconsin	17	34	37	40	20.5	29	35	38	41	42	43
REGION VI											
Arkansas	32	8	6	13	39.5	4	5	11	5	5	7
Louisiana	18	44.5	45	48	47.5	43	41.5	45	37	37	39
New Mexico	36	38	34	33	29.5	34.5	36	35	34.5	32	35
Oklahoma	24	26	18	25	11	33	27	31	19	10	19
Texas	3	3	1	2	22	3	2	3	12	8	6

TABLE 3 (continued)

	Total ES Applicants	Applicants Receiving Service			Applicants Counseled	Applicants Referred			Applicants Placed		
		All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	All Ages	40-54	55-64	All Ages	40-54	55-64
REGION VII											
Iowa	31	6	8	7	41	14	12.5	16	4	12	13.5
Kansas	33	14	12	18	13	16	17	18	11	14	15
Missouri	13	24.5	29	27	39.5	22	26	22	23	27	25.5
Nebraska	42	2	2	1	31	1	1	1	1	3	1
REGION VIII											
Colorado	29	33	31	29.5	23.5	32	28	27	33	29	31
Montana	41	28	25	23.5	4.5	36	38.5	37	6	2	3
North Dakota	44	10	16	11	19	10.5	15	8	8	14	8
South Dakota	43	5	3	8.5	10	10.5	3	7	7	6.5	9
Utah	37	12	11	19	20.5	7	6	14	13.5	16	20
Wyoming	50	18	15	12	17.5	21	19	18	3	1	2
REGION IX											
Arizona	25	9	9	14	51	8.5	12.5	13	9	6.5	11
California	1	32	24	16	47.5	26	20	12	26.5	22	17
Hawaii	40	40	41	45	42	41	38.5	42	44	43	45
Nevada	39	42	35	36	50	39.5	32	32.5	34.5	25.5	28.5
REGION X											
Alaska	49	22	22	26	32	23.5	22.5	25.5	16.5	23.5	27
Idaho	38	27	26.5	31	27.5	30.5	30.5	34	13.5	18.5	23.5
Oregon	26	17	7	5	14	17	11	5	20.5	9	4
Washington[3]	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

3. Washington excluded because comparable data not available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Council on The Aging, Inc.
1828 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036